

Interview Summary	Application No. 09/787,180	Applicant(s) MOTHES ET AL.	
	Examiner Monique T. Cole	Art Unit 1743	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Monique T. Cole. (3)_____.

(2) Evelyn Defillo. (4)_____.

Date of Interview: 18 March 2004.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: of record.

Identification of prior art discussed: Schobel.


Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: See Continuation Sheet.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an Attachment to a signed Office action.


Examiner's signature, if required

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The Examiner informed Ms. Defillo that she planned to discuss the instant application with an examiner more skilled in the coating art. The Examiner is uncertain at this time whether the amendment and response places the application in condition for allowance. The Examiner suggested that it may be helpful, as long as the specification is supportive, to place closed language such as "consisting of" in the claims. The response mentions such language, but the change was not incorporated into the claims.